

our State for 4 years. That was two terms, then, 2-year terms. He served our State admirably.

He became then, and has remained ever since, the most popular politician in Arkansas by far. I said the other evening, and I have said it many times, it pains me to say that. The thing that makes it bearable is I know it is true. Everybody in our State, virtually everybody, loves DAVID PRYOR, as does virtually every Member of the U.S. Senate.

In all of the years that DAVID has been in politics, and certainly all the years he has been in Congress, I have never heard anybody accuse him of having Potomac fever, and the reason he is easily the most popular politician in Arkansas is because he has never lost that common touch of letting people know that he is concerned about them. He never looks past you to see who is next in line. You get his undivided attention, no matter how crazy the idea might be. DAVID PRYOR has always been a listener.

I read a book one time called, "Lee, The Last Years." It is the story of Robert E. Lee after the war, written by a man named Charles Bracelen Flood. And the most poignant part of the book was a description of Lee after he surrendered to Grant at Appomattox. He then got on his horse Traveller and, with a small entourage of Confederate officers and men, started on roughly a 5-day trek from Appomattox Courthouse to Richmond, where a home had been prepared for him.

As they went through various southern villages and communities, huge crowds lined the streets awaiting for hours the arrival of Lee and his entourage—rebel yells, unbelievable cheers, of people for this losing General.

About the third day of this trek toward Richmond, Lee stopped at a point where a battle had been fought and there were still rotting corpses on the battlefield. He got off his horse and he waved his arm toward the battlefield and he said, "This could have been avoided." And the rest of what he said I paraphrase, but it was essentially this: At the time when this Nation needed men of courage and vision and restraint, we had politicians who saw that it was to their advantage to foment the flames of war. And this is the result.

James Fallows has written a book called "Breaking the News: How the Media Undermines American Democracy." It is a very interesting and almost unassailable hypothesis, in this book. But I can tell you, democracy always hangs by a thread. And here we have a man like DAVID PRYOR, who has all the qualities that Robert E. Lee described, and more: tenacious, determined on what he believes, intellect, the character to stick with his ideas in a totally honest way, and vision about where the country ought to be heading. These are remarkable traits to be wrapped up in one man, and rare and unusual in the U.S. Congress. So, at a

time when democracy perhaps hangs by a more slender thread than ever, losing a man like DAVID PRYOR, who possesses those qualities, is just short of disastrous for the country and certainly, to me, as a friend and colleague.

In the years I have served with DAVID, almost 18 years, now, I have never seen him duck a tough vote, though there have been plenty of opportunities. He has always been able and willing to take the heat in order to cast those votes.

When DAVID came to the Senate he had been Governor 4 years, but we really did not know each other. We knew each other politically, and we would see each other at political events, and we were friends. But it was only after he came to the Senate that we developed a friendship in the truest meaning of the word. So, I have been close to him in a lot of his travail. I can tell you, I do not know of very many people who have suffered in their personal life as much as DAVID—really, terribly traumatic things. Despite all of that, including the current trauma, I have never seen him down. I have never seen him look for sympathy or indicate that he was looking for sympathy.

I remember when my wife, Betty—and I do not mind saying this now, because it was about 15 years ago—was diagnosed with cancer. It was a dicey situation. She was going to be operated on at Georgetown at 8:30 in the morning. I got there at 8, and DAVID was already there. I guess that morning was the sealing of this, what will now be a lifelong friendship.

During his entire adult life since he graduated law school, he and Barbara have undergone these traumatic experiences together. She has been by his side. I have watched her. I have watched her strength. I have watched her values sustain her and DAVID both. And in all fairness, she has never been shy about expressing her thoughts and ideas with her beloved husband, DAVID.

Then, of course, it has been a love affair. I know that DAVID never loved anybody else from the day he set eyes on Barbara Lunsford and they have both been tremendous parents to three very fine sons—they are so proud of them, and justifiably.

While I am senior by 4 years to DAVID PRYOR in the U.S. Senate, he has been my mentor, my consultant, and my best friend. I will miss him and I wish him Godspeed and good luck.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FAMILY AND MEDICAL LEAVE ACT

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I had the pleasure earlier today of listening to

the distinguished Senator from Connecticut talk about the Family Leave Act. He talked in very laudatory terms of the many positive changes that it has brought about.

Mr. President, I also want to voice a positive response to the fact that employers do provide family leave, a time to be with their family and loved ones at a time that is important, during medical emergencies. But, Mr. President, I think it would be a shame to allow the subject to pass without observing what the real issue was.

The real issue in the Family and Medical Leave Act was not that people should have time with their families. Of course they should. Many employers provided that before the act was in place. Certainly I believe, within the possibilities of jobs—not all jobs have flexibility—but within the possibilities of the jobs involved, that certainly should be the case in terms of company policy.

But, Mr. President, with all due respect to the distinguished Senator from Connecticut, he just doesn't get it. One of the tragedies, I think, of our system as it developed is that our legislative bodies are populated by people who have not had the experience of real work in the private sector. They have not had an opportunity to be involved in business and understand what is involved when you have an essential function that has to be done and someone is not there.

Perhaps most of all, Mr. President, many, unfortunately, do not understand what they have done to our country in the last few years by flooding it, inundating it with regulations and rules and laws.

I think of it in terms of the company that I used to work for. When I was corporate counsel, it was myself and a part-time assistant secretary. Right now, that same function, with similar responsibilities, is composed of four full-time attorneys, three legal assistants, and a backup division of more than 120 people. Do they do a better job than I did? Yes; I suspect they do.

But, Mr. President, what has happened is an explosion of regulation. The problem is not whether or not people should have family medical leave. The problem is whether or not the Federal Government ought to dictate the minute details of how jobs are run in this country, how things operate in this country.

The question is not whether or not we have an economy that is flexible and variable or whether or not we divert the resources of this country to micromanage things from the top; the question, with all due respect to those who worked so hard on that piece of legislation, is not whether or not you have family or medical leave. Of course you ought to have it. The question is whether or not you have a Government, a Federal Government, that sees its responsibility as one of centralizing control of the Nation, one of mandating and dictating the details of how we live our daily lives.

It may come as a surprise to some, but most Americans are pretty good at knowing what is good for them. They might even know better than those of us in Washington who so often tell them what to do.

RECESS

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now stand in recess until the hour of 2:15 today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senate will be in recess until 2:15.

There being no objection, at 12:23 p.m., the Senate recessed until 2:14; whereupon, the Senate reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. COATS).

Mr. COHEN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. COHEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now go into a period of morning business with Members allowed to speak for up to 5 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, are we in morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is in morning business, with Senators allowed to speak for up to 5 minutes.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be allowed to speak for 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from North Dakota is recognized to speak for 10 minutes.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I would like to make two points today; one very brief and then I would like to make some remarks, along with my colleague, Senator ASHCROFT, and introduce a piece of legislation.

NO CHANGE IN THE FEDERAL FUNDS RATE

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, the first point is that the Federal Reserve

Board apparently now has broken up its meeting today and announced that there will be no change in the Federal funds rate—the interest rate that the Federal Reserve sets that has a significant impact on our economy, obviously.

I have been a frequent critic of the Federal Reserve Board. I would say that, if they have decided not to increase interest rates today, I commend them for that decision. I think it is the right decision.

The Federal funds rate is already one-half of 1 percent above where it ought to be historically, given the rate of inflation. There is no justification for an interest rate increase by the Federal Reserve Board. Inflation is under control—well under control—coming down 5 years in a row. Last month there was a one-tenth of 1 percent increase in the Consumer Price Index, virtually no inflation. So there was no basis for the Federal Reserve Board to consider an interest rate increase.

Some have suggested the Fed would meet in secret today if they wanted to, go in the room, shut the door, and make the decision in secret, and it would in effect increase interest rates today in order to respond to what they consider to be the need in the marketplace. But the Fed apparently decided not to do so. Again, I want to say that I think that is the right decision for this country, and for our economy because they ought not fight a foe that does not exist with remedy that is inappropriate. That is what they would have done, if they had increased interest rates today.

I found it interesting the other day that the Washington Post had a story saying the FBI has been called out to find out who leaked information at the Fed about what the regional Fed bank presidents have recommended with respect to interest rates. I would much sooner see the FBI called out to find out who withheld information from the American people, and what they talk about is the incredible secrecy of this institution called the Federal Reserve Board. Would it not be nice if everyone could have all the information about how and when they make decisions about monetary policy instead of calling the FBI out to find out who leaked information so the American people have some knowledge about who was recommending what on interest rate policies?

Mr. President, thank you. That is therapy for me to get that off my chest this early after the Federal Reserve Board met and apparently made the right decision. There is an old saying. "Even the stopped clock is right twice a day." I will not compare the Fed to a stopped clock, but at least to say that the Fed is right on interest rates. They did not change the rate. There was no justification in making a change, and they should not have made a change.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota is recognized.

Mr. DORGAN. I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Mr. DORGAN and Mr. ASHCROFT pertaining to the introduction of S. 2108 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. SANTORUM addressed the Chair. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

PARTIAL-BIRTH ABORTIONS

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, I think it is appropriate, as a result of the comments of the Senator from North Dakota and the Senator from Missouri, to talk about another issue that deals with the issue of life, an issue that will be before us in a very short few days. That is the issue of partial-birth abortions.

I took to the floor on Friday afternoon when this place was pretty empty to talk about the issue of partial-birth abortions. I said at that time that while the term "partial-birth abortion" is used, this is not a pro-life or pro-choice issue. This is not whether you are for or against abortion. This debate should be limited, must be limited to the procedure that we are discussing, and that is the procedure called partial-birth abortions.

I said at that time that I thought we should have a good debate, that the Senate, being the greatest deliberative body in the history of the world, should live up to its moniker, that we should have a deliberate, thoughtful debate on facts. I felt if we did have such a debate here, if we had such a deliberate, thoughtful debate, that, in fact, people who may have voted one way the last time, when presented with all the facts, in reexamining all the information that has come to light since the original vote in the Senate, might feel compelled to vote for this bill and override the President's veto.

I read an article today in the Washington Post that gave me some hope that people who consider themselves to be pro-choice can take a good look at the facts and change their mind on this procedure, this gruesome procedure. What gave me heart was an article published today in the Washington Post by Richard Cohen. Richard Cohen is a columnist who proclaims himself to be, and has consistently been, pro-choice. He believes in the woman's right to choose—in fact, in this article so states again.

Mr. Cohen, back in June of last year, wrote an article that condemned the bill.

In fact, it says, "In Defense of Late-Term Abortions," Tuesday, June 20, 1995, the Washington Post.

He goes on to give his reasons why he believes that partial-birth abortions should continue to be legal in this country.

Fast forward to today an article by Richard Cohen: "A New Look at Late-Term Abortion":

A rigid refusal even to consider society's interest in the matter endangers abortion rights.